Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03995 301213Z

44
ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 EURE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00 INRE-00

CIAE-00 PM-03 H-02 INR-07 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-05 PA-01

PRS-01 SP-02 SS-15 ACDA-05 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 CU-02 IO-10

OIC-02 SAM-01 /073 W
---------- 130261
O R 301120Z JUL 75
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2942
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY HELSINKI
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR
USLOSACLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L USNATO 3995

HELSINKI FOR THE SECRETARY'S PARTY

E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: NATO, PARM, CSCE, PFOR

SUBJ: IMPLEMENTATION OF CONFIDENCE BUILDING MEASURES

FOLLOWING IS PAPER ON NOTIFICATION OF MANEUVERS CIRCULATED BY CANADIAN REP AT JULY 29 POLADS (SEE SEPTEL):

BEGIN TEXT:
THE PARAMETER ON THE CONTENT OF NOTICE OF MAJOR MILITARY MANEUVRES IS, OF COURSE, THE ONE PARAMETER DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE IFORMATION THA WILL PASS BETWEEN STATES WHEN IMPLEMENTING THIS CBM. THUS, IF DOCUMENTS ARE SIGNED IN HELSINKI AT THE END OF JULY, IT WILL BE ESSENTIAL THAT EARLY CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN NOT ONLY TO WHAT MANOEUVRES ARE FORTHCOMING THAT WILL REQUIRE NOTICE, BUT ALSO TO HOW THAT NOTICE WILL BE PROVIDED CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 03995 301213Z

AND, MORE PARTICULARLY, WHAT IT WILL CONTAIN. TO ASSIST THOSE WHO WILL HAVE TO PREPARE THE NOTICE ITSELF, THE COMMENTS BELOW ARE INTENDED TO PROVIDE BACKGROUND INFORMATION AMPLIFYING THE TEXT AS AGREED.

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006

THE TEXT CONTAINS TWO SENTENCES AS FOLLOWS:

"NOTIFICATION WILL CONTAIN INFORMATION OF THE DESIGNATION, IF ANY, THE GENERAL PURPOSE OF AND THE STATES INVOLVED IN THE MANOEUVRE, THE TYPE OR TYPES AND THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF THE FORCES ENGAGED, THE AREA AND ESTIMATED TIME FRAME OF ITS CONDUCT. THE PARTICIPATING STATES WILL ALSO, IF POSSIBLE, PROVIDE ADDITIONAL RELEVANT INFORMATION, PARTICULARLY THAT RELATED TO THE COMPONENTS OF THE FORCES ENGAGED AND THE PERIOD OF INVOLVEMENT OF THESE FORCES."

IT MAY BE NOTED THAT THIS TEXT CONTAINS A COMPULSORY SENTENCE AND ONE THAT IS DISCRETIONARY. IT WILL THUS BE NECESSARY TO DECIDE THE EXTENT TO WHICH ANY NATO STATE MIGHT WISH TO OFFER INFORMATION THATIS LEFT TO ITS OWN DISCRETION. THIS DECISION OUGHT TO BE TAKEN, INTER ALIA, IN LIGHT OF THE EXTENT TO WHICH IT MIGHT BE DESIRABLE TO SET PRECEDENTS.

ITEM BY ITEM OBSERVATINS ON THE TEXT ARE AS FOLLOWS:

A) "DESIGNATION, IF ANY":

FOR SOME TIME THE WARSAW PACT WERE SUSPICIOUS THAT THIS STATEMENT CONCEALED AN ATTEMPT TO DETERMINE CODE NAMES; HOWEVER, BY THE END OF THE DAY THEY WERE FINALLY BROUGHT TO REALIZE THAT THIS WAS INTENDED AS NOTHING MORE THAN THE USUAL ADMINISTRATIVE TOOL OF GIVING A MANOEUVRE A NAME SO THAT REFERENCES BACK AND FORTH COULD BE MADE.

B) "THE GENERAL PURPOSE":

THE DEGREE OF PRECISION THAT MAY BE GIVEN IN THIS REGARD WAS NOT DISCUSSED IN NEGOTIATIONS ANDTHUS IT WOLD BE UP TO EACH STATE TO DETERMINE HOW VAGUE OR SPECIFIC IT MIGHT WISH TO BE . ONCE AGAIN THIS WILL HAVE TO BE DETERMINED BY NATO STATES.

C) "THE STATES INVOLVED":

THIS PHRASE IS INCLUDED TO PROVIDE FOR A NOTIFYING STATE, IN THE CASE OF MULTINATIONAL MANOEUVRES, TO INDICATE WHAT OTHER STATES ARE INVOLVED WITH THEM. THIS IS AS CLOSE AS THE SUB-COMMITTEE GOT TO ANY AGREEMENT ON WHO WOULD ACTUALLY DO THE NOTIFYING. THE COMPLEXITIES OF DETERMINING THIS WERE SUCH THAT THE SUB-COMMITTEE COULD NOT ARRIVE AT ANY RESPONSIBLE CONCLUSION AND THE QUESTION WAS SIMPLY SIDE-STEPPED ALTHOUGH THIS PHRASE ENSURES THAT THE RECEIVER OF THE NOTICE WILL BE AWARE

CONFIDENTIAL

OF WHAT COUNTRIES ARE INVOLVED.

D) "THE TYPE OR TYPES":

ONCE AGAIN STATES CAN DETERMINE THE EXTENT TO WHICH THEY WISH TO BE PRECISE AS TO THE TYPE OF FORCES ENGAGED. THE PHRASE ITSELF IS INTEDED TO ENCOURAGE A BREAKDOWN ("OR TYPES") RATHER THAN MERELY SAYING "LAND FORCES", FOR EXAMPLE.

C) "NUMERICAL STRENGTH":

THERE WAS SOME ATTEMPT TO HAVE THIS TERM READ IN THE PLURAL TO ENCOURAGE EVEN FUTHER A BREAKDOWN OF THE COMPONENTS OF FORCES IN THE MANOEUVRE BUT THIS COULD NOT BE AGREED AND THUS THE WAY IS OPEN, FOR EXAMPLE TO THE WARSAW PACT, TO GIVE MERELY A SINGLE OVERALL NUMBER. AT THE SAME TIME, HOWEVER, THERE IS NOTHING THAT WOULD PREVENT OTHER STATES FROM GIVING BREAK-

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006

DOWNS, AGAIN IF THEY WISH TO SET PRECEDENTS OR SIMPLY OFFER MORE INFORMATION FOR ANY REASON.

F) "OF THE FORCES":

MUCH LIKE THE TWO PRECEDING SUB-PARAGRAPHS, THE WORD "FORCES" RATHER THAN SIMPLY "TROOPS" POINTS TOWARD THE POSSIBILITIES OF BREAKING DOWN THE UNITS THAT ARE IN THE MANOEUVRE.

G) "ENGAGED":

FOR SOME TIME THIS PHRASE READ 'INVOLVED' BUT WARSAW PACT STATES PREFERRED THE WORD 'ENGAGED'. IT MIGHT BE ASSUMED FROM THIS THAT THE SOVIETS WOULD CONSIDER THAT TROOPS INVOLVED BUT NOT DIRECTLY ENGAGED IN THE MANOEUVRE COULD BE EXCLUDED.

H) "THE AREA":

THIS RATHER UNSATISFACTORY WORD COULD NOT BE DEFINED MORE CLOSELY TO MAKE IT SPECIFIC AS TO WHAT AREA WAS BEING UTILIZED, AND THUS, AGAIN, IT WILL HAVE TO BE DECIDED BY NATO STATES HOW PRECISE THEY WISH TO BE. THERE WAS NOT, IN DEBATE, ANY INDICATION OF HOW PRECISE THE SOVIETS MAY CONSIDER THIS TERM, BUT WHEN CHECKING THEIR NOTICES IT MIGHT BE WORTH OBSERVING WHETHER OR NOT THEY ARE SO VAGUE AS TO WAY SOMETHING ALONG THE LINE OF "WESTERN RUSSIA" OR WHETHE THEY ARE INDEED MORE FORTHCOMING.

I) "ESTIMATED TIME FRAME OF ITS CONDUCT":

THE WORD ESTIMATED IS THE RATHER PRACTICAL REQUIREMENT TO ENSURE THAT IN THE VENT OF SLIPPAGE OF PLANNING DATES STATES WOULD NOT HAVE ABROGATED AGREEMENT REACHED. "TIME FRAME" IS NOT A MAGIC WORD AND IS INTENDED ONLY TO REFLECT DATES.

COMMENTS ON THE NON-COMPULSORY CONTENT ARE AS FOLLOWS:

CONFIDENTIAL

A) "ADDITIONAL RELEVANT INFORMATION":

UNTIL THE FINAL DAYS OF THE CONFERENCE, THE TEXT ENDED AT THIS POINT AND THE PHRASE WAS INTENDED ONLY TO OPEN THE WAY FOR ANY OTHER PRACTICAL INFORMATION THAT A STATE MIGHT WISH TO OFFER. THIS COULD HAVE BEEN SIMPLE WARNING THAT DATES WERE NOT FIRM OR THAT ADDITIONAL UNITS MIGHT BE ADDED, ETC. THIS PHRASE SHOULD STILL BE UNDERSTOOD AS HAVING THAT MEANING DESPITE THE FACT THAT THE SENTENCE THEN GOES ON.

B) "RELATED TO THE COMPONENTS OF THE FORCES ENGAGED":

THIS PHRASE REPLACES MORE SPECIFIC WORDING THAT WOULD HAVE BEEN ACCEPTABLE TO NATO AND WHICH WAS VERY MUCH DESIRED BY THE NEUTRAL AND NON-ALIGNED STATES CONCERNING THE QUALITY OF THE FORCES BROKEN DOWN BY THEIR TYPE AND STRENGTH AND LEVELS OF COMMAND. AS WITH SOME OF THE PHRASES PREVIOUSLY, DISCUSSED, IT IS AN INVITATION TO EXPAND UPON THE BROADER TERMINOLOGY, PARTICULARLY AS TO TYPES OF FORCES AND STRENGTHS.

C) "THE PERIOD OF INVOLVEMENT":

IT WAS IMPOSSIBLE TO GAIN WARSAW PACT APPROVAL TO NOTIFYING THE DATES OF MOVEMENT OF TROOPS AND THIS PHRASE IT SINTENDED AS ENCOURAGING FUTHER INFORMATION ON THE DATES OF INVOLVEMENT BEYOND MERELY THE DATES OF THE MANOEUVRE ITSELF. IT IS OF COURSE DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE QUESTION OF DISPERSAL

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006

OF TROOPS AS WELL AS ASSEMBLY.
D) "OF THESE FORCES":
THE TERMINOLOGY HERE WAS THE FINAL COMPROMISE PROPOSED BY THE SOVIETS TO ENSURE THAT A PHRASE SUCH AS "PERIOD OF THEIR INVOLVEMENT" WOULD NOT BE INCLUDED WHICH WOULD SUGGEST A BREAKDOWN OF THE DATES OF MOVEMENT OF COMPONENTS WITHIN THE MANOEUVRE. THUS THIS PHRASE IS WORDED TO INDICATE THAT ONLY VERY BROAD DATES NEED BE GIVEN RATHER THAN SPECIFIC JOINING AND DEPARTING DATES OF UNITS.
END TEXT. BRUCE

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 30 JUL 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: WorrelSW
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO03995
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t197507102/abbrzlgl.tel
Line Count: 175
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: WorrelSW
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 30 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <30 APR 2003 by MartinML>; APPROVED <30 SEP 2003 by WorrelSW>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: IMPLEMENTATION OF CONFIDENCE BUILDING MEASURES
TAGS: NATO, PARM, CSCE, PFOR
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO BONN
HELSINKI
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR
USLOSACLANT

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006

Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006